Serial No. 09/846,830   11
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment is proper because it does <u>not</u> raise any new issues requiring

further search by the Examiner, narrows the issues on appeal, and is believed to place the present

application in condition for immediate allowance.

Claims 1-5, 12, and 32-67 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

Claims 1, 32-36, 61, 64, and 66 have been amended to define more clearly the features of

the present invention.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out

the invention, and <u>not</u> for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or

for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicants specifically state that no

amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to

an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 1-5, 12, and 32-67 stand rejected on prior art grounds.

Particularly, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 33, 34, 61-64, 66, and 67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Masek (U.S. Patent No. 5,272,749) in view of Enzmann et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 6,320,946; hereinafter "Enzmann"). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Masek in view of Enzmann and further in view of Clitherow

(U.S. Patent No. 5,479,494). Claims 32, 42-45, 49, 52, and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being obvious over Masek in view of Hou et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,325,421). Claim 35

stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Masek in view of Riskin (U.S.

Patent No. 4,817,129). Claims 36 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious

over Masek in view of Yamakita (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,698).

Serial No. 09/846,830   12
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

On the other hand, claims 12, 37-41, 46-48, 50, 51, 53-60, and 65 stand rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Riskin and claims 12, 37, and 65 stand rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Masek.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I.   THE CLAIMED INVENTION

The claimed invention is directed to an improved calling procedure including a method

for connecting a user to a telephone number.

In an illustrative, non-limiting embodiment of the present application, as defined by

independent claim 1, a method for connecting a user to a telephone number, including receiving

a phone address entered by a caller, determining an entry modality device, from a plurality of

entry modality devices, used by the caller to enter the received phone address, decoding the

received phone address according to the determined entry modality device, consulting a

reference table using the decoded phone address, the reference table being periodically updated

by a centralized master reference table, and connecting the caller to the telephone number that

results from the step of consulting the reference table.

In another exemplary embodiment of the present application, as defined by independent

claim 12, a system for determining telephone numbers includes a memory including program

code stored therein and a processor connected to the memory for carrying out instructions in

accordance with stored program code. The program code, when executed by the processor,

causes the processor to receive from a caller an ambiguous phone address, select an ambiguity

resolving parameter from a plurality of ambiguity resolving parameters, collect additional

Serial No. 09/846,830   13
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

information specified by the selected ambiguity resolving parameter, and determine, using the

additional information, whether the phone address resolves to a telephone number.

Independent claims 37, 61, and 64-66 recite somewhat similar features as independent

claims 1 and 12.

Conventional telephone numbers for North American domestic calling typically consist

of seven digits plus a three digit area code. However, a string of seven seemingly random digits

is difficult to remember because there is no apparent logical connection between a called party

and the string of digits that constitutes the party's number. One solution has been to use the

alphabet characters listed on the keys of the telephone's keypad to enter mnemonics. However,

the availability of possible mnemonics is severely limited because there are only seven digits in

the telephone number and more than one letter corresponds to each digit, among other reasons.

Other conventional methods include providing directory assistance to callers. However,

this system also has drawbacks because it can be expensive, time consuming, and may require

the user to know certain information, such as the full name of the party and/or the city where the

party resides, among other things.

The claimed invention (as defined, for example, by independent claim 1), on the other

hand, provides a method for an improved calling procedure that is capable of determining an

entry modality device from a plurality of entry modality devices, thereby being capable of

receiving a phone address, which may include a plurality of numbers, letters, phrases, sounds,

handwriting entries, or sequences thereof. Thus, while the claimed invention is capable of

receiving conventional seven digit telephone numbers, the claimed invention also is capable of

distinguishing between different entry modality devices from a plurality of entry modality

devices, such a voice, keypad, telephone keypad, alphanumeric keyboard, and handwriting entry

Serial No. 09/846,830   14
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

modality devices, and then decoding the phone address of the party being called according to the

determined entry modality device (e.g., see specification at page 3, lines 9-14).

Moreover, the claimed invention (as defined, for example, by independent claim 12) is

capable of resolving ambiguities between a plurality of parties corresponding to the same phone

address, or a restricted party corresponding to one phone address by selecting an ambiguity

resolving parameter from a plurality of ambiguity resolving parameters (e.g., see specification at

page 3, lines 14-20).

II.   THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

A.   Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 33, 34, 61-64, 66, and 67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Masek in view of Enzmann.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner alleges that "*Masek teaches alphabetic and

alphanumeric entry modalities*", as opposed to a plurality of entry modality devices (e.g., a

telephone keypad, computer keyboard, etc.), and thus, that Masek teaches the claimed "plurality

of entry modalities" (see Office Action at page 8, numbered paragraph 11).

As the Examiner points out, Masek merely discloses entering either an alphabetic or an

alphanumeric sequence of digits by "dialing" such sequences using a conventional telephone

(e.g., see Masek at column 3, lines 65-68 and column 4, lines 1-9; see also column 8, lines 40-52

and column 10, line 56 to column 12, line 10).

However (as the Examiner appears to acknowledge), Masek does not disclose or suggest

any other entry modality device other than a conventional telephone, or for that matter,

determining between a plurality of entry modality devices.

Serial No. 09/846,830   15
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

In comparison, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a method for connecting a user to a

telephone number, including:

>   receiving a phone address entered by a caller;
>   determining an entry modality device, from a plurality of entry
> modality devices, used by said caller to enter the received phone
> address;
>   decoding said received phone address according to the
> determined entry modality device;
>   consulting a reference table using the decoded phone address,
> said reference table being periodically updated by a centralized
> master reference table; and
>   connecting the caller to the telephone number that results from
> said consulting the reference table (emphasis added).

In other words, the claimed invention provides a method for an improved calling

procedure that is capable of determining an entry modality device from a plurality of entry

modality devices, thereby being capable of receiving phone address, which may include a

plurality of numbers, letters, phrases, sounds, handwriting entries, or sequences thereof.

Thus, while the claimed invention is capable of receiving conventional telephone

numbers (e.g., seven digit telephone numbers, etc.), the claimed invention also is capable of

distinguishing between different entry modality devices from a plurality of entry modality

devices (e.g., a voice entry modality device, a keypad entry modality device, a telephone keypad

entry modality device, an alphanumeric keyboard entry modality device, and a handwriting entry

modality device, etc.) and then decoding the phone address of the party being called according to

the determined entry modality device (e.g., see specification at page 3, lines 9-14).

Contrary to the claimed invention, Masek simply discloses "*dialing*" an alphabetic or an

alphanumeric sequence using a conventional telephone as the sole entry modality device.

Serial No. 09/846,830   16
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

Masek clearly <u>does not discern between entry modality devices from among a plurality of</u> <u>entry modality devices</u> or even <u>determine whether the entry modality device being used is</u> <u>different</u>.

Thus, Masek does <u>not</u> disclose or suggest "<u>determining an entry modality device, from a</u> <u>plurality of entry modalities devices,</u> used by said caller to enter the received phone address", or for that matter, "decoding said received phone address <u>according to the determined entry</u> <u>modality device</u>", as claimed in independent claim 1.

Moreover, Enzmann does <u>not</u> make up for the deficiencies of Masek.

Indeed, Enzmann is <u>not</u> relied upon for the teaching of "<u>determining an entry modality</u> <u>device, from a plurality of entry modalities devices,</u> used by said caller to enter the received phone address", or for that matter, "decoding said received phone address <u>according to the</u> <u>determined entry modality device</u>", as claimed in independent claim 1. Instead, Enzmann is relied on for teaching a computer that periodically updates an information server (e.g., periodically updates databases)(see Office Action at page 3, lines 14-21).

Applicants further submit that, even assuming *arguendo* that Masek did disclose the features of the claimed invention mentioned above, it would <u>not</u> have been obvious to combine Masek and Enzmann to arrive at the claimed invention.

For example, in contrast to the claimed invention, Masek is primarily concerned with "a <u>switching</u> application", <u>not</u> to a user interface according to the claimed invention (e.g., see Abstract; see also column 1, lines 8-28). On the other hand, Enzmann merely discloses a payphone or coin-operated telephone <u>that functions as an information transmittal device for</u> <u>dispensing user-selected information audibly to the user</u>, for example, via the speaker in the payphone handset (e.g., see Enzmann at Abstract).

Serial No. 09/846,830   17
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

Thus, Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to combine a telephone

switching application for a conventional telephone system with an information transmittal device

that merely dispenses user-selected information audibly to the user, in order to arrive at the

claimed invention, which is directed to a novel and unobvious method for connecting a user to a

telephone number.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that there are elements of

independent claim 1 that are not disclosed or suggested by Masek and Enzmann, either alone or

in combination, and therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of

claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 33, and 34.

Moreover, Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to combine Masek and

Enzmann to arrive at the claimed invention, absent impermissible hindsight based analysis.

With respect to claims 61-64, 66, and 67, Applicants submit that these claims also are

patentable over Masek and Enzmann, either alone or in combination, for somewhat similar

reasons as independent claim 1.

For example, independent claim 61 recites, *inter alia*, a method for connecting a user to a

telephone number, including "determining an entry modality device, from a plurality of entry

modality devices, used by a caller to enter a received phone address; decoding said received

phone address according to the determined entry modality device" (emphasis added).

On the other hand, independent claim 64 recites, *inter alia*, a system for connecting a user

to a telephone number, including "a determiner that determines entry modality device, from a

plurality of entry modality devices, used by a caller to enter a received phone address; a decoder

that decodes said received phone address according to the determined entry modality device"

(emphasis added).

Serial No. 09/846,830   18
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

Independent claim 66 recites, *inter alia,* a system for connecting a user to a telephone

number, including "<u>a determiner that determines an entry modality device, from a plurality of</u>

<u>entry modality devices</u>, used by said caller to enter the received phone address; <u>a decoder that</u>

<u>decodes </u>a received phone address from a caller<u> according to the determined entry modality</u>

<u>device</u>" (emphasis added).

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that there are elements of

independent claim 1 that are <u>not</u> disclosed or suggested by Masek and Enzmann, either alone or

in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the

rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 33, 34, 61-64, 66, and 67.

Moreover, Applicants submit that it would <u>not</u> have been obvious to combine Masek and

Enzmann to arrive at the claimed invention, absent impermissible hindsight based analysis.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections

and permit claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 33, 34, 61-64, 66, and 67 to pass to immediate allowance.

B.   Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Masek in view of Enzmann and further in view of Clitherow.

For somewhat similar reasons as those set forth above, neither Masek nor Enzmann,

alone or in combination, discloses or suggests all of the recitations of independent claim 1.

Moreover, Clitherow does <u>not</u> make up for the deficiencies of Masek and Enzmann.

Indeed, Clitherow is <u>not</u> relied upon for the teaching of "<u>determining an entry modality</u>

<u>device, from a plurality of entry modalities devices</u>, used by said caller to enter the received

phone address", or for that matter, "decoding said received phone address<u> according to the</u>

<u>determined entry modality device</u>", as claimed in independent claim 1.

Serial No. 09/846,830   19
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

Instead, Clitherow merely discloses a virtual calling card system in which the caller *dials*

"0" followed by a ten-digit telephone number (e.g., see Clitherow at Figure 3, see also column 3,

lines 60-65 and column 6, lines 31-34). Thus, Clitherow similarly discloses only one entry

modality device (i.e., "dialing" a conventional telephone).

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that there are elements of independent claim 1

(from which claim 3 depends) that are <u>not</u> disclosed or suggested by Masek, Enzmann, and

Clitherow, either alone or in combination.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of

claim 3 and permit this claim to pass to immediate allowance.

C.   Claims 32, 42-45, 49, 52, and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

obvious over Masek in view of Hou.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 32, 42-45, 49, 52, and 54 are patentable by

virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 37, respectively.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the novel and unobvious combination of

elements recited in claims 32, 42-45, 49, 52, and 54 is <u>not</u> disclosed or suggested by Masek and

Hou, either alone or in combination.

The Examiner alleges that Hou "*teaches voice commands for recognizing destinations to*

be dialed" and thus, that it would have been obvious to combine Hou and Masek "*in order to*

provide users with choices for identifying their destinations" (e.g., see Office Action at page 5,

numbered paragraph 5).

However, Applicants respectfully submit that it is not enough merely to identify the

elements of the claimed invention in different references, but instead, the Office Action must

Serial No. 09/846,830   20
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

establish *how* and/or *why* the ordinarily skilled artisan would have combined the references to

arrive at the claimed invention as a whole (i.e., to do that which the inventor has done).

For example, when considered as a whole for what it fairly teaches to the ordinarily

skilled artisan, the claimed invention provides a method for an improved calling procedure that is

capable of determining an entry modality device from a plurality of entry modality devices,

thereby being capable of receiving a phone address, which may include a plurality of numbers,

letters, phrases, sounds, handwriting entries, or sequences thereof, etc.

Thus, while the claimed invention is capable of receiving conventional telephone

numbers (e.g., seven digit telephone numbers, etc.), the claimed invention (as defined, for

example, by independent claim 1) also is capable of distinguishing between different entry

modality devices from a plurality of entry modality devices (e.g., a voice entry modality device,

a keypad entry modality device, a telephone keypad entry modality device, an alphanumeric

keyboard entry modality device, and a handwriting entry modality device, etc.) and then

decoding the phone address of the party being called according to the determined entry modality

device (e.g., see specification at page 3, lines 9-14).

Moreover, the claimed invention (as defined, for example, by independent claim 37) is

capable of resolving ambiguities between a plurality of parties corresponding to the same phone

address, or a restricted party corresponding to one phone address by selecting an ambiguity

resolving parameter from a plurality of ambiguity resolving parameters (e.g., see specification at

page 3, lines 14-20).

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the novel and unobvious

combination of elements recited in claims 32, 42-45, 49, 52, and 54 is not disclosed or suggested

by Masek and Hou, either alone or in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request

Serial No. 09/846,830   21
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 32, 42-45, 49, 52, and 54 and permit these

claims to pass to immediate allowance.

D.   Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Masek

in view of Riskin.

Claim 35 recites, *inter alia*, that "said plurality of entry modality devices comprises an

alphanumeric keyboard entry modality device" (emphasis added).

However, contrary to the Examiner's position, Riskin merely discloses using the

touchpad of the telephone to input alphabetic indicia, which is then transmitted to a computer,

which has the alphanumeric keyboard (e.g., see Riskin at column 2, lines 1-15; emphasis added).

That is, it is the computer system (which receives the input by the caller using an ordinary

telephone) that has the alphanumeric keyboard, not the telephone being used to input the

information (e.g., see Figure 1 and Figure 14).

Moreover, the Examiner has not established *how* such a combination of Masek and

Riskin would arrive at the claimed invention, or identified any motivation in the cited references

or in the art in general, for such a combination. Instead, the Examiner merely states that it would

have been obvious to combine the references "*to provide users with choices for identifying their

destinations*" (e.g., see Office Action at page 6, numbered paragraph 6).

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that conclusory statement alone, without

support in the references or the art in general, are not sufficient to establish obviousness.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to

combine Masek and Yamakita to arrive at the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner

respectfully is requested to withdraw this rejection and permit claim 35 to pass to allowance.

Serial No. 09/846,830   22
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

E.   Claims 36 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Masek

in view of Yamakita.

Claim 36 recites, *inter alia*, that "said plurality of entry modality devices comprises a

handwriting entry modality device" (emphasis added).

The Examiner alleges that both "*Masek and Yamakita are in analogous identification of*

destination telephone number art", and therefore, it would have been obvious to combine these

references (e.g., see Office Action at page.6, numbered paragraph 7; emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully disagree.

As mentioned above, Masek relates to a special features telephone dialing and switching

application system for interconnection to an interaction with the switching system of a central

telephone office for converting subscriber-created telephone numbers to standard assigned

telephone numbers (e.g., see Masek at Abstract).

On the other hand, Yamakita relates to a portable terminal device for transmitting image

data via a network (e.g., see Yamakita at Abstract), such as transmitting by e-mail (e.g., see

Yamakita at column 2, lines 53-56) or by fax (e.g., see Yamakita at column 3, lines 19-26).

Thus, Masek and Yamakita are not both related to "*identification of destination telephone*

number art" as alleged.

Moreover, the Examiner has not established *how* such a combination of Masek and

Yamakita would arrive at the claimed invention, or identified any motivation in the cited

references or in the art in general, for such a combination. Instead, the Examiner merely states

that it would have been obvious to combine the references "*to provide users with choices for*

identifying their destinations" (e.g., see Office Action at page 6, numbered paragraph 7).

Serial No. 09/846,830   23
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that conclusory statement alone, without

support in the references or the art in general, are not sufficient to establish obviousness.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that it would <u>not</u> have been obvious to

combine Masek and Yamakita to arrive at the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner

respectfully is requested to withdraw this rejection and permit claim 36 to pass to allowance.

F.   Claims 12, 37-41, 46-48, 50, 51, 53-60, and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

102(b) as being anticipated by Riskin.

Applicants submit that there are elements of claims 12, 37-41, 46-48, 50, 51, 53-60, and

65 which are <u>not</u> disclose or suggested by Riskin, and therefore, respectfully traverse this

rejection.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner alleges that Riskin "*teaches a plurality of*

collisions (last names with the same numeric strings and multiple occurrences of first names)

which are resolved differently by asking a caller for different confirmations" (see Office Action

at page 9, lines 5-8, citing Riskin at column 16, lines 37-56).

<u>For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully disagree.</u>

Independent claim 12 recites, *inter alia*, a system for determining telephone numbers,

including:

>a memory including program code stored therein; and
>a processor connected to said memory for carrying out
>instructions in accordance with stored program code;
>wherein said program code, when executed by said processor,
>causes said processor to:
>receive from a caller an ambiguous phone address;
><u>select an ambiguity resolving parameter from a plurality of</u>
><u>ambiguity resolving parameters;</u>

Serial No. 09/846,830   24
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

<u>collect additional information specified by said selected
ambiguity resolving parameter; and
determine, using said additional information, whether said
phone address resolves to a telephone number</u> (emphasis added).

On the other hand, independent claim 37 recites, *inter alia*, a method for determining a

telephone number, including:

receiving an ambiguous phone address from a caller;
<u>selecting an ambiguity resolving parameter from a plurality of
ambiguity resolving parameters;
collecting additional information specified by said selected
ambiguity resolving parameter; and
determining, using said additional information, whether said
phone address resolves to a telephone number</u> (emphasis added).

Independent claim 65 recites, *inter alia*, a system for determining telephone numbers,

including:

<u>a selector that selects an ambiguity resolving parameter from a
plurality of ambiguity resolving parameters;
a collector that collects additional information</u> specified by said
selected ambiguity resolving parameter; and
<u>a determiner that determines, using said additional information,</u>
whether an ambiguous phone address from a caller resolves to a
telephone number (emphasis added).

The claimed invention is capable of resolving ambiguities between a plurality of parties

corresponding to the same phone address, or a restricted party corresponding to one phone

address <u>by selecting an ambiguity resolving parameter from a plurality of ambiguity resolving</u>

<u>parameters</u> (e.g., see specification at page 3, lines 14-20).

That is, the claimed invention selects from parameters such as the caller's present

location (e.g., location of the caller, a predetermined radius of a location of the caller, and/or a

latitudinal and longitudinal coordinate of the caller, as defined by dependent claims 39, 40, and

41), the phone number the caller is placing the call from (e.g., as defined by dependent claim 38),

the caller's personal or group ID (e.g., voice print, voice sample, and/or predetermined phrase

that is audibly input by the caller; e.g., as defined by dependent claim 42, 43, 44, 45), and/or the

caller's response to query (e.g., by asking the caller to respond to a query; e.g., as defined by

dependent claim 53), etc.

Riskin, on the other hand, merely resolves duplicates (i.e., same first names) and

collisions (i.e., two different last names result in the same numeric string) by asking the caller to

respond to a query (e.g., see Riskin at Figure 14; see also column 16, lines 37-56).

That is, when a duplicate occurs, the computer asks the caller to confirm the last name,

and then asks the caller to enter the first name so that it can differentiate between two duplicates.

When a collision occurs, the computer asks the caller for the first name without confirming the

last name.

In other words, in Riskin, the ambiguity is resolved only by a single parameter. The

single *parameter* consists of asking the caller to respond to a query, such as confirming the name

of the party being called.

The claimed invention, on the other hand, selects an ambiguity resolving parameter from

a plurality of ambiguity resolving parameters and collects additional information specified by the

selected ambiguity resolving parameter.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that there are elements of independent claims 12,

37, and 65 that are not disclosed or suggested by Riskin. Therefore, Applicants respectfully

request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claims 12, 37, and 65.

Serial No. 09/846,830   26
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

Moreover, with respect to dependent claims 38-41, 46-48, 50, 51, and 53-60, Applicants

submit that Riskin also does not disclose or suggest the novel combination of features defined by

these claims.

Indeed, the Examiner has not identified any disclosure in Riskin in which the ambiguity

resolving parameters include the caller's present location (e.g., location of the caller, a

predetermined radius of a location of the caller, and/or a latitudinal and longitudinal coordinate

of the caller, as defined by dependent claims 39, 40, and 41), the phone number the caller is

placing the call from (e.g., as defined by dependent claim 38), the caller's personal or group ID

(e.g., voice print, voice sample, and/or predetermined phrase that is audibly input by the caller;

e.g., as defined by dependent claim 42, 43, 44, 45), and/or the caller's response to query (e.g., by

asking the caller to respond to a query; e.g., as defined by dependent claim 53).

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that there are elements of claims 12, 37-41,

46-48, 50, 51, 53-60, and 65 which are not disclosed or suggested by Riskin. Therefore,

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

G.   Claims 12, 37, and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being

anticipated by Masek.

Applicants submit that there are elements of claims 12, 37, and 65 which are not

disclosed or suggested by Masek, and therefore, respectfully traverse this rejection.

As mentioned above, independent claim 12 recites, *inter alia*, a system for determining

telephone numbers, including:

> receive from a caller an ambiguous phone address;
> select an ambiguity resolving parameter from a plurality of
> ambiguity resolving parameters;

> collect additional information specified by said selected
> ambiguity resolving parameter; and
>> determine, using said additional information, whether said
> phone address resolves to a telephone number (emphasis added).

On the other hand, independent claim 37 recites, *inter alia*, a method for determining a telephone number, including:

> receiving an ambiguous phone address from a caller;
> selecting an ambiguity resolving parameter from a plurality of
> ambiguity resolving parameters;
>> collecting additional information specified by said selected
> ambiguity resolving parameter; and
>> determining, using said additional information, whether said
> phone address resolves to a telephone number (emphasis added).

Further, independent claim 65 recites, *inter alia*, a system for determining telephone numbers, including:

> a selector that selects an ambiguity resolving parameter from a
> plurality of ambiguity resolving parameters;
>> a collector that collects additional information specified by said
> selected ambiguity resolving parameter; and
>> a determiner that determines, using said additional information,
> whether an ambiguous phone address from a caller resolves to a
> telephone number (emphasis added).

The claimed invention is capable of resolving ambiguities between a plurality of parties corresponding to the same phone address, or a restricted party corresponding to one phone address by selecting an ambiguity resolving parameter from a plurality of ambiguity resolving parameters (e.g., see specification at page 3, lines 14-20).

That is, the claimed invention selects from parameters such as the caller's present location (e.g., location of the caller, a predetermined radius of a location of the caller, and/or a latitudinal and longitudinal coordinate of the caller, as defined by dependent claims 39, 40, and

Serial No. 09/846,830   28
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

41), the phone number the caller is placing the call from (e.g., as defined by dependent claim 38),

the caller's personal or group ID (e.g., voice print, voice sample, and/or predetermined phrase

that is audibly input by the caller; e.g., as defined by dependent claim 42, 43, 44, 45), and/or the

caller's response to query (e.g., by asking the caller to respond to a query; e.g., as defined by

dependent claim 53).

Masek, on the other hand, merely discloses using <u>digit input translators</u> to translate a

number input by the customer and match it with the actual number of a subscriber to the service

(e.g., see Masek at column 4, line 49 to column 5, line 9; see also column 8, lines 40-52).

Indeed, Masek specifically discloses that:

> it is an object of the present invention to provide <u>a telephone dialing and</u>
> <u>switching system for converting a customer selected and specified</u>
> <u>sequence of alphabet letters and/or numbers</u> of one or more letter and/or
> digit length which has personal or business significance to the customer
> (as dialed by a third party) <u>to a second (assigned) telephone number</u>
> having a standard number of digits with little or not personal or business
> significance.

(see Masek at column 10, lines 57-65; emphasis Applicants').

In other words, in Masek, the ambiguity is resolved <u>only by a single</u> *parameter*, which

consists of the number that is input by the user.

The claimed invention, on the other hand, <u>selects</u> an ambiguity resolving parameter <u>from</u>

<u>a plurality of ambiguity resolving parameters</u> and collects additional information specified by the

selected ambiguity resolving parameter.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that there are elements of independent claims 12,

37, and 65 that are <u>not</u> disclosed or suggested by Masek. Therefore, Applicants respectfully

request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claims 12, 37, and 65.

Serial No. 09/846,830   29
Docket No. YOR920000311US1
(YOR.523)

III.   CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-5, 12, and 32-67, all the claims

presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in

condition for <u>allowance</u>. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to

issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to

discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any

overpayment in fees to Assignee's Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

In accordance with M.P.E.P. § 706.07(f), this Amendment has been filed <u>within the two</u>

<u>month period for reply to a final Office Action</u> because the due date of September 19, 2004 fell

on a weekend. Thus, the shortened statutory period for reply should expire on the mailing date

of the Advisory Action <u>or</u> at three months from the date of the final Office Action, <u>whichever is</u>

<u>later</u>.

                                          Respectfully Submitted,

Date: _September 20, 2004_   _____
                                          John J. Dresch, Esq.
                                          Registration No. 46,672

                                          Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
                                          Registration No. 34,386

McGinn & Gibb, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254